Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

as G. Phœnicis, either do not belong to this genus or are a distinct species, named provisionally *G.* (?) *compressa* Fisch.

The most important paper is *Beitrag zur Kentniss der Gattung Graphiola.* Ed. Fischer, *Bot. Zeit.* 1883, Nos. 45, 46, 47 and 48.

Bot. Lab., Univ. of Michigan. ERWIN F. SMITH.

Parasitic fungi of Missouri.—During the past five or six years the writer has devoted considerable attention to the fungi of Missouri, and during that time, with the assistance of Prof. S. M. Tracy and Rev. C. H. Demetrio, about 400 strictly parasitic species have been taken. Most of the species were taken in the central and southeastern parts of the state and, while no collections of importance were made in the western counties, late observations in these parts have convinced me that here the flora, so far as relates to fungi, is practically the same as that of the more carefully explored region. With very few exceptions, all of the species taken have been preserved either in my own herbarium or that of Mr. Demetrio.

Quite a number of the species have been distributed in Ellis' *North American Fungi* and Winter's *Fungi Europaei et Extra Europaei.* A careful list of all the species, together with their hosts, has lately been prepared, and as it now stands this list includes the following:

Uredineæ, 105 species, divided among the following genera: Æcidium, isolated forms, 41; Cæoma, 2; Coleosporium, 2; Gymnosporangium, 1; Melampsora, 4; Peridermium, 1; Phragmidium, 3; Puccinia, 33; Rœstelia, 2; Uredo, 2; Uromyces, 14.

Ustilagineæ, 16 species, divided as follows: Doassansia, 1; Entyloma, 3; Tilletia, 2; Urocystis, 1; Ustilago, 9.

I have several times collected a curious Ustilago upon Polygonum Hydropiper. The fungus attacks the flowers and greatly distorts them, producing in many cases large black globular swellings. This is probably the same form mentioned by Dr. Farlow (BOT. GAZETTE, viii, 277) as resembling *U. Bistortarum* (DC.). What appears to be the same thing has lately been issued in Dr. Winter's *Exsiccatæ* under the name *U. Austro-Americana* Spez., from South America.

Peronosporeæ, 17 species, distributed as follows: Cystopus, 5; Peronospora, 11; Phytopthora, 1.

Erysipheæ, 24 species, upon 47 hosts, as follows: Erysiphe, 3; Microsphæra, 8; Phyllactinia, 1; Podosphæra, 1; Sphærotheca, 5; Uncinula, 6.

Imperfect forms, nearly 200 species, so-called, divided among the following genera: Asterina, Cercospora, Cladosporium, Coniothyrium, Cylindrosporium, Diplodia, Entomosporium, Gleosporium, Ramularia, Septoria, etc.

The remainder of the list, some 35 species or more, is made up of members of the following genera: Epichloe, Leptosphæria, Phyllachora, Sphærella, Taphrinia, etc.—B. T. GALLOWAY, *Washington, D. C.*

The black maple.—Last fall I contributed to an horticultural journal an account of the conspicuous differences between Acer saccharinum and its so-called variety nigrum, giving figures of the characteristic dissimilarities in foliage and fruit.[1] The statement was made that the two maples are evidently specifically distinct. At all events, they are so unlike in general appearance that they may be recognized at a glance at a distance of four or five rods. In ornamental value they are clearly different. A new study of trees in flower and in young foliage also reveals characteristic differences. In my judgment the two are distinct species. I have not been able to detect intermediate forms. The following characterizations will separate them.

Acer saccharinum Wangenheim.—Leaves three to five-lobed, the sinuses narrow and deep, the lobes furnished with large and long-acuminate teeth, glabrous, plane, rather thin, the basal sinus open; stipules, none : nodes of the young shoots usually reddish: inflorescence smooth or nearly so; bracts none or minute: staminate flowers somewhat campanulate; the calyx two lines or less in length: lobes of the fruit little spreading.

Acer nigrum Michaux.—Leaves larger, three-lobed, the sinuses very broad and shallow, the lobes entire or very bluntly toothed, the apex not so prominently acuminate, pubescent or villous beneath and also on the petiole when young, limp, the sides conspicuously drooping, thick and soft, the basal sinus usually closed or the lobes overlapping and causing the leaf to appear slightly peltate; stipules conspicuous, foliaceous and ciliate, early caducous;[2] nodes of the young shoots not colored: inflorescence pubescent or villous; the bracts conspicuous and ciliate: staminate flowers cylindrical; the calyx two and a half or more lines long: fruit smaller, the lobes usually diverging.—In aspect this species is much heavier and duller than the other, owing to the drooping and wilted appearance of the large cloth-like leaves.—L. H. BAILEY, *Agricultural College, Mich.*

EDITORIAL.

IT IS THOUGHT by some to be desirable for every form of scientific work to have its center at Washington. The reason for this is partly sentimental, for it sounds large to have a "national" museum or a "national" herbarium, and partly financial, for it is argued that only the government can support such things in any worthy way. The financial reason is a good one, as any one will concede, for that government which has given its fostering care most liberally to scientific work has to-day

---

[1] *Popular Gardening*, Nov. 1881, 24, 4 figs.

[2] Observations upon the occurrence of stipules in this species are also recorded in *Amer. Nat.*, vi, 767, vii, 422, and by Wheeler, *Mich. Cat.*, 23.